

RACHAEL E. STEWART, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 14122  
Law Office of Rachael E. Stewart  
400 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 500  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
Telephone: (702) 772-3260  
Facsimile: (702) 552-4761  
restewartlaw@gmail.com  
*Attorney for Joseph Coppola*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.  
JOSEPH COPPOLA,  
  
Defendants.

CASE NO: 2:99-cr-00217

**STIPULATION TO CONTINUE  
REVOCATION HEARING**

(First Request)

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Melanee Smith, Assistant United States Attorney, and Joseph Coppola, by and through his attorney, Rachael E. Stewart, that the Revocation of Supervised Release Hearing currently scheduled for March 9, 2023, at the hour of 10:30 a.m., be continued for a period of thirty days, to a date and time convenient to this Court.

This stipulation is entered for the following reasons:

1. The parties recognize that the preliminary hearing in this case had been continued multiple times before waiving the preliminary hearing and proceeding with the revocation. The continuances have been due to the parties working through specific issues in the case in order to come to a resolution before the revocation hearing.

2. Additionally, the parties request a continuance because the United States Probation Officer assigned to the case has a scheduling conflict with the current setting. Although it is typical that a U.S. Probation Officer would have another officer cover the hearing, this case involves very extensive negotiations and discussions, and it would be most appropriate for the assigned U.S. Probation Officer to be present.
3. Defense Counsel has spoken with Assistant United States Attorney Melanee Smith, and the Government agrees to the continuance.
4. Defendant Joseph Coppola is in custody, and he does not oppose the continuance.
5. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay.
6. Denial of this request for a continuance would deny the parties sufficient time to prepare for the revocation hearing, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
7. Additionally, denial of this request for continuance could result in a miscarriage of justice.

This is the first stipulation to continue the revocation hearing in this case.

DATED this 8th day of March, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rachael E. Stewart  
Rachael E. Stewart, Esq.  
Counsel for Joseph Coppola

/s/ Melanee Smith  
Melanee Smith, Esq.  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Counsel for the United States of America

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.  
JOSEPH COPPOLA,  
  
Defendants.

CASE NO: 2:99-cr-00217

## ORDER TO CONTINUE REVOCATION HEARING

(First Request)

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based on the pending Stipulation of counsel, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court finds that:

1. The parties recognize that the preliminary hearing in this case had been continued multiple times before waiving the preliminary hearing and proceeding with the revocation. The continuances have been due to the parties working through specific issues in the case in order to come to a resolution before the revocation hearing.
2. Additionally, the parties request a continuance because the United States Probation Officer assigned to the case has a scheduling conflict with the current setting. Although it is typical that a U.S. Probation Officer would have another officer cover the hearing, this case involves very extensive negotiations and discussions, and it would be most appropriate for the assigned U.S. Probation Officer to be present.

3. Defense Counsel has spoken with Assistant United States Attorney Melanee Smith, and the Government agrees to the continuance.
4. Defendant Joseph Coppola is in custody, and he does not oppose the continuance.
5. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay.
6. Denial of this request for a continuance would deny the parties sufficient time to prepare for the revocation hearing, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
7. Additionally, denial of this request for continuance could result in a miscarriage of justice.

### **CONCLUSION OF LAW**

The ends of justice served by granting said continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defense, since the failure to grant said continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice, would deny the defendant sufficient time and the opportunity within which to be able to effectively and thoroughly prepare for the revocation hearing, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

### **ORDER**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Revocation Hearing scheduled for March 9, 2023, at the hour of 10:30 a.m., be vacated and continued to the 4th day of May, 2023, at the hour of 9:00 a.m. in Courtroom 6C

DATED AND DONE this 8th day of March, 2023.



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE